

Meeting Description: Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

Date: July 10, 2003

Time: 10:00 a.m. **Location:** Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 10th Floor, Conference Room

I. Approval of March and June Meeting Minutes

II. Geographic Framework Program

A. Version 3

Rob Surber, Michigan Center for Geographic Information (CGI), reported Version 3 is available in many formats. A copy has been provided to the folks who asked for it. It is available in shape files and coverages for those interested in formats. CGI is doing customized deliveries over the next month or so. A Geographic Information System (GIS) version has been done and it is available. If there is a need for Version 3 before it gets into the data library let CGI know. A Sufficiency Version that relates to Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) road rating process has gone out. A file has been sent to the Asset Management Council data collection vendor, Michigan Technological University (MTU), and they are incorporating the framework into the Asset Management collection tool that will be distributed to all the regions, counties, engineers, villages, and cities. Then will provide training to use data and software for the collection asset management software this summer. If involved in asset management expect to have Version 3 to work with. If you have been collecting data on Version 1, MTU has committed to moving data forward for you. CGI has created a framework digital Control Section Atlas. It is a product that MDOT uses. It is a GIS file that has just the trunk line on it and the crossroads to the next intersection of crossroad. It looks like AAA Trip Tic. It is a pared down version of the state file. Other products and deliveries will be coming out next month or so. There will be various layers of shape files available.

Gordon Rector, US Census Bureau, asked if updates from this point on will become part of Version 4 and if so, what is the time frame.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded there will be an annual release of the referencing version that will come out in May but CGI can cut a GIS dated versions at any point capturing updates to Version 3. The importance is that the referencing version will probably have mile points blanked out for the GIS version releases because it gets confusing migrating data on the road system. A lot of GIS offices don't need that. It will come with disclaimers. Once a year will come out with complete new referencing version for the GIS community. CGI has already started Version 4. It will have the same naming convention. There is also a date associated with it. Check with Everett Root, CGI, to be sure. CGI had the Act51 reconciliation project that through a curve on getting this out.

B. Next Steps

Rob Surber, CGI, reported CGI completely mapped the Federal Aid Urban Boundaries (FAUB) that go beyond census boundaries for funding distribution for the road system are currently being reviewed by MDOT. It is tied to a number of federal programs. There are attributes that relate to Functional Class. Can make a GIS version available when it is acceptable by the QAQC process. This information will be an integrated part of Version 4.

Joyce Newell, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), stated that local areas will be getting map with Functional Class changes. MDOT will contact each region to see what changes they need in the Functional Classification Codes.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated there are very few new lines that had to be added to most of the boundaries. CGI is doing a review of the Framework Classification Code (FCC) scheme. The

FCC code was derived from the old Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) and the Census Feature Classification Code. There are areas to clean up. In Version 4 this will be a lot better field to work with from the GIS standpoint. CGI has begun working on the rail network. CGI has also had a couple different vendor demonstrations for automated labeling of framework. They are about to the point of getting a product in-house to create layers of annotation for generalizations including the master framework file. Labels will be distributed as layers along with other framework layers. This will help CGI because they do a number of automated mapping overnight processes that spit out change for a variety of state government map products that CGI wants to be able to automate framework into that. There are a few that are still using labels and annotations in Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) files and CGI wants to move away from that and have current framework labeled. CGI talked with the Census Bureau's vendor who was able to handle the Census Bureau's cartographic map production needs.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, asked if CGI is checking to see if text annotation can be converted to other GIS software.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded one of the criteria is platform independence and being able to go back and forth between various products. Another is that they can be managed in a geographic database - literally linked with IDs to features. Another characteristic is dealing with change - over time if framework is updated don't want to re-label half of the map if there is no change. But if new roads are built, will be able to identify them quickly and have new labels for the change areas. Or if the attribute changes or the feature moves a little, they will be able to identify programmatically and deal with the delta. The plan is to have a product that everybody can use. Alden Leatherman, CGI, is working on number of polygon update tools in ArcInfo using the framework. There is a base network but has boundaries that are constantly changing and they are coincident with some features (roads, rivers, rail). Need to select features and reattribute everything. Working on polygon update tools that are going to be mix and match, but there will be core tools that regardless of precincts or city/township boundaries, staff will go in and work with that and do number crunching and adjustments to framework. Don't want to have a GIS analyst doing editing work but plan to use students to do production type activities. CGI is testing tools and they are working well.

C. Digital Ortho Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported new imagery from United States Geographic Services (USGS) process arrived. The major thing now is Map Michigan Internet application has aerial photo tab that says "To Be Available Soon". It will happen real soon. CGI has been loading the complete set of orthos for the state into SDE, but there has been problems loading them. Have to do clean up but will have imagery available in the Map Michigan product within next few days. Will be able to zoom in any way in the state and have nice Internet photos.

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Library, asked if there is going to be a multiple year time series.

Rob Surber, CGI, responded it will come be based on the demand. CGI had to get more disk space to get one complete statewide set. They are in SDE as TIFs for the whole state. The state has the archived for previous years, but will probably keep the most recent set out there for the users based on the specifications and requirements for Map Michigan. If interested in multiple years, CGI will have to beef up on server space. Some of it is available on the data library and have to be downloaded into something to work in. The goal is to serve the public. At the last meeting, there was demo of Michigan Recreational Boating Information System (MrBIS) on Map Michigan Architecture and provides the flavor to the boaters in the state who want to know where to dock and load their boats on the lakes. It needs the images. CGI will make images available to specific subject applications on the web portal. A number of applications will be

coming out soon. History Art and Library (HAL) has an application coming out that will use Map Michigan technology with those photos available in a variety of formats and flavors. CGI is using SQL because of staff expertise and cost. It will be best available and seamless statewide. There are a few edges that can be seen. They are coming in as is and there will be disclaimers. Some black and white are better than others but all are visible and passed the specifications and quality control of USGS. CGI will rebuild pyramid and things in SDE as a critical mass becomes available. Once a few counties become available, they will redo an area. CGI has three areas of the state – the Upper Peninsula, northern Lower Peninsula, and southern Lower Peninsula.

D. Framework Network Pilot Partnerships Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported CGI had productive meeting at Allegan County. They looked at the whole concept of local units of government partnering with framework maintenance and the updates of that. The state level thinks a certain way to meet state needs but they know that they are not getting the big picture a lot of the time. CGI wants to make sure the county and local level has tested their approach. CGI wants to meet the local's needs. There is not a one-size-fits-all. Each county's political climate, each county's movers and shakers are going to be different. CGI is not going to come in and steamroll. But do want to have enough structure that a county can latch onto some of the best practices in certain situations. There will probably be tiers of county situation types. The plan is to define tiers to meet county needs and they can see themselves fitting into a model of how they are organized, share information, and how they can participate with the state in the framework network and ongoing information flow. May have participation at the regional or city level, but the first pass is that the county level makes sense. There is the top tier of counties that are off the charts as far as being able to do many things; and another group that is situated well in county, have a GIS office, can do things, may have close ties with the county executive, and may be able to work across departmental lines; some counties with GIS offices that may be imbedded in the Equalization Office and may squelch any activities; and those without any GIS activity at all. There are still the business needs of communicating through the state. The state's goal is to empower as much as they can and strengthen the local GIS coordination. Where that is not happening, CGI can probably provide extra tools or assistance. CGI would like stakeholders to buy into the concept of why coordination is important. Want to propose incentives for the clerks' association, the road commissions, and the equalization offices to be involved. For example, the clerk in Allegan County has very tangible budget reasons why this coordination with working with the GIS office saves them money. It provides them with information and planning tools – they create numbers of ballots based on certain demographic and types of information. Budgets are tight and if they can show how GIS is enabling them to pinpoint the number of ballots per precinct then they are sold because it makes business sense. CGI is working on ways to promote that. They are working on standards and data model issues. But the more important issue is the salability of this to the decision makers. Ultimately CGI will be the last resort. If nobody else will do it, CGI will do the work, but would look to empower local GIS offices to be at the center of the communication and activity. This makes sense not only for the GIS user community but also for local government in general.

Gordon Rector, United States Census Bureau, asked in a community or a county that has a sophisticated GIS knowledge and ability, is Rob talking about getting to the point of sending them an extract of the framework and they would feed it back to CGI?

Rob Surber, CGI, responded that would occur if there were not GIS office doing maintenance and editing. Every GIS office wants some say about their own files and work with their own data and their own business reasons. CGI is not going in and saying that they have to drop what

they are doing and edit framework. CGI wants to make sure that if GIS offices say that they will take over these types of themes of information or these data items, and they are going to be the conduit and everything coming out of their office will be certified. Certification is a key component. CGI would like the local level to duke it out over what is official and do it on their data file. What CGI is looking for is a common id structure between the files. Framework has the foundation for the locals to adopt the id structure that CGI has. Tools to migrate that is one of the areas to look at. There is going to be synchronization and some problems where there is a different in design and model. CGI wants to programmatically update as much as possible. CGI thinks that this will strengthen the county or local GIS offices' position with their respective agencies in their communities. If you are a county that is not well organized and are afraid they are missing the bus, CGI will do a lot of the work. But if at some point the county is organized CGI will gladly turn the reins over to them. Wants to make this practical and real.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, added that the most fundamental level of thought was to create a web interface where a county has only a clerk and no GIS capacity at all. They can pull up the orthos from '99 with the framework roads and trace in a poly line showing where the road goes, with the address range and click submit.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that then it comes in certified and if there is a problem, it goes to the clerk for resolution not the state. CGI wants to get out of that role. There is a county that has an Equalization Officer who would love to be doing this but has not been given any authority to work with the other departments. The climate may change and they can start getting on board. With Homeland Security and some of the issues related to reduced funding, we have to be creative about how we work together and share resources.

Rosemary Anger, Barry County GIS, stated that if aid is offered it is to the clerk not to the GIS office. You have to convince the clerk that they need the GIS office.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that it opens up new opportunities. It shows GIS relevance in other areas. We need to get more people to understand that GIS makes sense for day-to-day business and bottom line dollars-and-cents. CGI wants to go slow and document what they are learning, how they are going about it, and what they are learning. It is ideal if there is a GIS office willing to coordinate and consolidate the information. It is conceivable that the GIS office may handle some things and another office may add certain attributes. It is important that they communicate. If there are problems with data not matching, CGI will send it back to locals to work out.

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County, added that the road commission will often know of new roads before the clerks do. Clerks would not know about it until they are ready to enter a new voter.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that the clerk is often way down the process. CGI often knows about it before the clerk because of the Subdivision Control Act. Some times that changes and it is better if coming from a GIS office. If the road commission can funnel to GIS office early on before the clerk needs the information and it is done and ready to receive information for the voter registration process. One of the discussion items is taking this on the road and promoting it. CGI wants to create a glossy flier and take on road. The Allegan County Clerk is going to help draft some of the language that would be meaningful to clerks to help them to understand why this important. It is critical that they make it relatable – it will come from their own people saying how it has benefited them. CGI can go to counties, talk to commissioners, other elected officials, administrators, and board of commission to promote this. One other item that came out of the meeting is the link between the postal service and the local units of government. CGI had the first of 4 meetings with each district post office administrator. Have also been in touch with Memphis, the United States Postal Service (USPS) headquarters, and they are supportive and encouraged CGI to meet with district managers and talk about how to work together. Yesterday

CGI met with the Milwaukee administrator and his regional address group in Green Bay for the western Upper Peninsula. CGI plans to go to Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Royal Oak. They now have a proposal to go to Memphis about how they coordinate information on a regular basis from the local level up through the sharing of information. CGI will provide maps and tools to the USPS if that will help them. Royal Oak is starting to use framework to delineate zip code boundaries for plans when making changes to zip codes. Zip codes are an important attribute on the framework base that everybody uses. Would like to get USPS working with the local units of government. The USPS has a product called Geo Limited, it is a Maptitude process, that the district offices use to do GIS work and manage their information. They use Census TIGER. They want to drop in framework and work directly on framework. Want to achieve uniformity and that the framework has good up-to-date zip codes. USPS may be finding problems out there that CGI wants funneled back to local units of government. It will be another check in the process to be sure the information is good.

E. Rail Update

Rob Surber, CGI, reported there is a meeting scheduled with the Michigan Railroad Association. They represent all the major rail companies in the state. The purpose is to look at what the Michigan Department of Transportation's (MDOT) role is in the rail process and what the state's integration into framework role is and looks at what they are interested in. CGI is looking at incentives to partnering to get information on a regular basis – what can CGI offer them, what can they get and what can CGI get. There are reporting requirements with MDOT. It does not cover all things that a GIS office can use. CGI is working on a rail-crossing database to integrate. The rail network is based on topography 1:24,000 scale so is better than Census TIGER. 1960 vintage of rail is in there now and a lot has been removed. CGI plans to not just remove rail features, but if there is a right-of-way that can become a trail, it will be kept in there but classified differently. CGI will label as active/inactive.

F. National Map

Rob Surber, CGI, reported the National Map is a USGS initiative to take topographic maps to the 21st century. One component is a distribution library of data nodes that are registered with the National Map and want local information by themes as much as possible. There is a set of rules about which nodes will be pulled up based on query. There were discussions about who established rules. CGI is interested in seeing how framework fits into that. CGI is setting up a pilot node on the National Map network to explore how framework can be a part of that for distribution. The incentive is exposure for the framework project and further strengthening relationship with local units of government. There will probably be information that CGI does not integrate or that is more current than what CGI has integrated. Where CGI sees the value is at county lines - if zoomed into county lines and want to create a good topographic, will need a good data set that is integrated. If zoomed into a county, things are not integrated at the local level. Have to have rule bases to know to go to CGI to get the information. These are some of the things they are discussing. The train is leaving the station so CGI might as well get on it. The risks of not participating are greater than participating.

G. National Hydro Dataset (NHD)

Rob Surber, CGI, reported CGI is looking at how the Water Resources Institute of Michigan State University (MSU) can help CGI. CGI needs help getting local units of government involved funneling hydro information into the framework. CGI does not have the business case mapped out. There is a proposal for them to go for a grant. What are the incentives for the locals to partner with the state to work on an integrated approach to getting good hydro information and keeping it current. CGI needs help to create a business case. Rob doesn't want

to be the spokesperson – he would like somebody from the water group to promote this. CGI wants to improve the 1:24,000 scale.

III. Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Projects and Activities

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the Wildlife Division teams with the Michigan Natural Features Inventory (MNFI) group. They keep track of the endangered and protected species. One important process is the CEPAS system – must have approval to be sure there are no endangered species in the area before you plan to do something. There is an authorization period and a big backlog. They are proposing an online environmental review system that uses framework and sections; allows you to type in an address. It will return a result stating that you are clear based on this area. They will protect the data where the species locations area. There is talk about moving this with archeological sites. They want to move to an online web interface with a map base, using framework, using Map Michigan technology. The goal is to go from a 30-day turn around to instantaneous. They are tied into the MDNR Wildlife. There is secrecy because people will take things that are endangered and disrupt the site. CGI is working out final details of the plan. It will probably move forward in the next month or two.

John Esch, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), commented that this will be huge, because there are a number of programs, like a cleanup site they want to restore, now it is a slow process.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the Michigan Recreation Boating Information System (MrBIS) site is on michigan.gov front page – there is a Quick Link. It is built on ArcIMS and allows zooming into various boating access points.

IV. Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported they getting Version 3 coverage into a workable format for the rest of their department. They use Caliper. Met with the drains people to decide what a pilot project might look like to make sure that the drains are in framework. They have not determined which two counties to work with. Will also have to determine roles for CGI, Michigan State Industries (MSI), MDOT and the local agencies would each play.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that CGI thinks that the MDOT process with the local units of government may be able to cover this, MDOT is only interested in trunk line and there is a lot more area that CGI needs to worry about.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that MDOT is only interested the County Drain Commissioners that assess MDOT. They haven't decided which counties they need to do. If paper maps to start from, may scan maps. There are a variety of levels of expertise. If there is an electronic base, will probably have other attribution, such as drain names. The MDOT Bureau Director sent e-mail asking about esthetics data file being applied to frame work. This is sections of roadways that are prime candidate for aesthetic improvements. It is already in a GIS. The file is being worked on to be put on the website, but doesn't have the appropriate tags (control section and x-y coordinates) to tag into the rest of MDOT databases. There are different categories available too. MDOT wants to attach physical reference (PR) mile points to it to tie to their projects. The website will point to areas you can apply for funding. MDOT will try to get on frame work this next fiscal year. This area is about 2,000 segments of roadway. MDOT has a pilot county of right-of-way maps scanned and rectified to framework. They can bring up in ARC, but it doesn't work in Caliper, which is what MDOT uses. Their GIS coordinator has been busy with Asset Management issues and has not had time to work on it. The real estate people are anxious to see these.

Chuck Bender, Michigan State Industries (MSI), asked if they use MrSID and if so is there format the MSI can create them in.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that they want to work on them a while. CGI may put up a temporary website to show these. Planning wants to show to MDOT's Real Estate Division staff. They are basically TIF files.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated there are a lot of uses for these and they are falling apart.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, commented that the issue is that the maps are not up-to-date and they need them to be up-to-date before they copy them, but that will take a while.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that the whole parcel mapping process of state right-of-ways can be reengineered. It has not been tackled as a state, but that is the direction that we should go.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that they want to preserve the maps that are becoming less readable until such time as they can be updated. MDOT wants to respect their real estate people by letting them put caveats on the maps to document that they were current as of..... Also working on Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) on framework, because there will be a statewide travel survey of households asking where they make trips to and from by address. They want to geocode to do travel analysis. MDOT is hoping to get the 2000 SEMCOG TAZs.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that CGI is now adding the recently submitted ones that went to the Census Bureau and they are being linked into framework. Might want to check to make sure. CGI is using data as it is being given to them. CGI wrote programs to do integration work but not doing quality control. The data is based on census blocks using 2001 and there are some lines that need to be added. MDOT is driving this project.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, stated that MDOT staff has contacted SEMCOG because they are hoping they do not have to do the SEMCOG region. MDOT is putting together an Asset Management team to collect roadway data for all federal aid roads in Michigan. They are collecting data in cooperation with regions and local areas. There will be training provided for this. That is one reason MDOT recently used framework to show where they are lacking pavement roughness data for Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) submittal. They took it to their pavement management people and advised that they need to collect data. Want to migrate to Version 3 before giving to SEMCOG. There was a Great Lakes Commission Data Sharing Workshop. This is a group collecting information about the Great Lakes and Great Lakes spaces. They want to come up with ways to share data across all agencies including the states and Canada around the Great Lakes. They are working on web access tools. They have a web site.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that this will be difficult to do because Canada has a different set of rules and the crown owns their data. Roger Gauthier and Stuart Eddy are involved if you have questions. There are a lot federal representatives in attendance.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, talked to a guy from Canada about road centerlines and he said that it might not be a big problem to share but the data that goes with it would probably have problems. Roads names can probably be shared but beyond that it will be difficult. Hard copy maps have not had a problem, but beyond that it is almost impossible. Canada is currently doing GPS for all roads in Ontario.

V. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Projects and Activities

John Esch, MDEQ, reported there is a proposal for a department-wide web ArcIMS site that has everything. In the Remediation and Redevelopment Division has 3,000 contaminated sites. With that data, they need the rare species data from MDNR and census data for population near contamination sites. This will be a huge effort and hope to use the Map Image Viewer for the

official data sets. They need to score these sites to GIS, which has not been used in the past. Want to roll out the Map Image Viewer. People are disappointed that the funding has been cut for the support for the State Map Image Viewer. MDEQ now has Rockford Plat Maps.

Rob Surber, CGI, added that any state agency that is contributing to the licensing can get into it. One note about the all-encompassing web site – there was a discussion to look at the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection web site. They have something like they want to do in Michigan. It is literally a one-stop place with different tabs to bring up information. As a service to constituents, it can be a time saver. It is going to MDEQ's IT board this summer.

John Esch, DEQ, stated that the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has been on the cutting edge of this stuff.

VI. Michigan State Police (MSP) Projects and Activities

Eric Nischan, MSP, reported that the management software for incident management and emergency management is being piloted at state agencies. When there is a disaster, everybody can log on to the Internet and any information passed back and forth can be accessed quickly and easily. MSP has integrated their IMS mapping function with framework data and state agency data, which MSP has collected. Now see MSP data and have option to map it and overlay on the data so that you can see the relationships in real time. Today they finally worked out bug and have it working smoothly. Have to get their SSL server secure. Then it will be safe to bring out beyond the MSP intranet. Then Eric will demonstrate to group soon.

VII. Michigan State Industries (MSI) Projects and Activities

Charlie Bender, MSI, reported MSI completed the drawing for the right-of-way and will submit the proposal to MDOT and then will find out what else they want to have done. MDOT approached MSI about digitizing the paper maps. MDOT also asked if MSI can plot from legal descriptions. The 60 lakes from MDNR Fisheries went down to 10 lakes because of budget. MSI finished the 10 below budget because of streamlining; MDNR may have MSI do several more lakes as well. MDNR wants MSI to identify specific factors for each of the processes in the digitizing process for 200 lakes and MDNR will try to budget for the additional 2,400 lakes in the state. The 'As Built' database for a second set of CDs has been completed and MSI is importing the data into the existing database. Once they do that and import the data MDOT just provided, they will import for MDOT's perusal and then MDOT can identify 1960 and newer and 1959 and older. Initially MSI wanted to use aerials and can zoom into docks. Trying to identify what DNR wants. A 30-40 minute time period went up to 8-10 hours per lake because of the level of data that they wanted. After the test, MDNR said they wanted everything done in TIFs. MSI created AMLs so just have to plug in basic changes to the entries and everything else stays the same.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that when MSI is done, CGI will make available on the data library. It is very useful and will be a nice dataset to have.

VIII. CGI Projects and Activities

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that CGI is working with the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) serving as an ArcIMS site for a new Disease Surveillance System which tracks diseases as reported from doctors' offices or through labs. Location is an important part because of public health and environmental. CGI is working with MDCH so that they will have a seamless integration and will come to the CGI server to pull maps. There is confidential information in there but they can aggregate it at the county and township level for statistics and

thematic mapping. This is funded through bio-terrorism Homeland Security funding – MDCH wants to get better tracking spatially.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that Standard and Poors has the educational MEAP test results on a web site. The governor's office has asked CGI to migrate data, at least initially, since Standard and Poors' contract runs out September 30. CGI is working on a plan for presentation to bring that into a new presentation for the state and continue that information coming in and link that with MI School Info online so there will be maps and reports on the MEAP. It will be one stop shop. The first step is to move S&P over to a state distributed site.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that the 2-1-1 systems is the human services related call – need for adoption services, food bank, etc. The governor is interested in this for a number of reasons. Some of the services are district-based and geographic-based and some are point-based. CGI is having discussions with Kent County United Way to look at a way to do it. For 9-1-1, you place a call and they send ambulance or fire truck. But 2-1-1 is based on coverage area of services, some are non-profits, some are churches, etc. It is very geo spatial base. Governor is behind this because of the Children's Action Network (CAN) project, one of the key things they had to determine was where the services for kids were.

IX. Michigan State University (MSU) Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Kathleen Weessies, MSU Map GIS Library, reported she learned a lot about Canadian GIS data at a conference last month and willing to share.

X. County / Local Projects and Activities

Valdis Kalnins, Allegan County GIS, reported they are very busy.

XI. Regional Projects and Activities

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, distributed the updated concept plan for their 2005 regional flight. They decided on the specifications of flight and a priority order. First choice is 3-color digital ortho, 6 inch pixels, leaf off; second choice is the same only black and white; third choice is color with one-foot pixels leaf on or leaf off. Meeting in August with the partners - seven counties. SEMCOG is pulling together request for purchase (RFP), which they will review in August. They hope to have a letter of commitment from each partner by September 1, so that SEMCOG partners are talking to their financial people who are talking to SEMCOG's financial people. The legal commitment comes after they choose a vendor and the cost. The partners decided that when they get the product each county will own the product and will have the rights to sell it, not SEMCOG. If anybody wants the information for the southeast region, they will have to go to each county to get it.

Rob Surber, CGI, stated that CGI received a letter and they are working on it. CGI is working on the budget process for 2005 and it is lining up okay with this. CGI is already working with MDOT and other departments to see what they are able to contribute. The state needs good imagery but in this budget climate it is tricky to build a business case and squeeze out the money.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, added that it would be nice if federal government agencies got on board too.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that it would be nice but cannot wait because it is too uncertain. As far as distribution, has any one talked about a resampled more generalized version being made available. The state has a need for its partners to be able to have some imagery. It is not

just being used internally. SEMCOG is not in the distribution business but the state is. The state never expected to be able to distribute the raw original data. The State plans to work on a funding mechanism and is going to fly anyway. So the state will have something to distribute that will be comparable. This is a way to try not to duplicate. The state will work the flights in over a 4-year period. The timing of when areas are done can be determined by groups that are getting together. Rob likes indicated that the SEMCOG approach is well thought out and it aligns with some of the thoughts of the state. There is always going to be the possibility that people may do their own thing. But will find that there will be base products that people will depend and rely on. Then the specialty things will come out.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, responded that is their thinking. That the region will fly every 5 years and in between they can do their own.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, reported that their 2000 Land Use update is almost wrapping up. They are still working on Wayne and Oakland Counties and the rest of the counties are in quality assurance. The 2000 blocks are limping along. Did just hire Steve Perry and have approval to hire 2 more interns.

Rob Surber, CGI, reported that he attended regional GIS session and there was good presentation on the history of land use by Jim Rogers, SEMCOG.

Ann VanSlembrouck, SEMCOG, stated their next regional meeting is in September. Geo Database will be the topic.

Abbi Mueller, West Michigan Region Planning Commission, reported that she is doing asset management training in July.

XII. Federal Projects and Activities

Gordon Rector, United States Bureau of the Census, reported they have been working with Everett Root, CGI, to get framework files for the rest of the state – many of which will probably go to their contractor in the fall for TIGER repositioning in fiscal year 2004 which begins in October. Gordon has not heard anything new about the 10 or so files that are being repositioned now. Monroe County is the pathfinder county for the whole country. When that breaks through the logjam, the other 10 counties for Michigan will follow and the other 74 counties in the country are being repositioned this year. Next year it jumps up to 600. Nationwide they are struggling to get 600 good county files like they have in Michigan and will probably do more Michigan files next year and hope that they can locate other files in other parts of the country for subsequent years.

Rob Surber, CGI, commented that other states have asked him what the Census Bureau likes about the Michigan model. Other states have requested a write-up on the Michigan Census Bureau model.

Gordon Rector, Census Bureau, stated that when they do the independent checking of positional accuracy of the framework files, they fall well within Census Bureau tolerance of 7.6 meters – a lot of them are below 4 meters. If they meet that standard, they are free.

XIII. Other Issues

Following is documentation provided by Joyce Newell, MDOT, explaining the MDOT's travel survey:

Comprehensive Household Travel Data Collection Program

The Statewide and Urban Travel Analysis Section is about to undertake the largest statewide data collection effort in the past 30 years. This effort is the second phase of a three-phase travel demand model improvement project. Phase I identified an improved travel demand model structure and the data necessary to support the models. This phase involves conducting a statewide household travel data collection program via a travel diary. During Phase III, models will be developed using the new model structure and the household diary data.

The household travel data collection program will provide modelers with the data necessary to update our travel demand models, which will enable us to make better decisions by improving project identification, project prioritization, detour analysis, land use analysis, and air quality conformity analysis.

Travel demand models are based on household travel behavior, including how many trips are made, how long the trips are, when they are made, and for what purpose. This data is gained through household travel data collection. With the exception of the SEMCOG area, household travel data has not been collected in Michigan since 1976. Collection efforts prior to that were in the 1960's.

Travel has changed significantly since the 1970's and the data collected from those household diaries no longer reflects current travel behavior.

We have since switched to using national default data for our travel demand models. However, we do not know how Michigan travel characteristics compare to the national default data.

This data collection effort will consist of a two-day travel diary completed by recruited households. Each household member will record all of their travel for a 48-hour period noting their times of travel, mode of travel, destination, and purpose of travel. After the data is retrieved from the participants, the household location and the origins and destinations of each trip will be geo-coded to Framework geography.

We will be collecting household diary data from 2,080 households in seven different sampling areas for a total of 14,560 households. SEMCOG plans to have a separate contract with the selected consultant to supplement our data collection with an additional 4,000 to 6,000 households.

We expect consultant selection to be completed in August with the household data being collected in the spring and fall of 2004. For more information, contact Karen Faussett (335-2956 or faussettk@michigan.gov).

XIV. Next Meeting Date

August 7, 2003, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m., Michigan Center for Geographic Information, George W. Romney Building, 111 S. Capitol, 10th Floor, Lansing, MI 48913